

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

The Office Action

Claims 5, 6, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ghanem (US 6,400,102).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghanem (US 6,400,102) and further in view of Yamashita, et al. (US 6,340,870).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghanem (US 6,400,102) and further in view of Kamoi, et al. (US 6,958,580).

Claims 2-9 and 12-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Rejection Under §112, Second Paragraph

The examiner has rejected claims 5, 6, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis. The rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 5, 6, 10, and 11 have been amended herein to cure the subject informalities.

The Anticipation Rejection

The examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ghanem (US 6,400,102). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 1 has been amended herein with subject matter deemed allowable by the examiner. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-14 should be allowed.

The First Obviousness Rejection

The examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghanem (US 6,400,102) and further in view of Yamashita, et al. (US 6,340,870). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and, thus, is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. In particular, claim 1 has been amended herein to include subject matter deemed allowable by the examiner. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Second Obviousness Rejection

The examiner has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghanem (US 6,400,102) and further in view of Kamoi, et al. (US 6,958,580). Likewise, this rejection should be withdrawn in light of the amendments to claim 1, which place claim 1 in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

The examiner has objected to claims 2-9 and 12-14 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. This objection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 2 has been incorporated into independent claim 1, placing claim 1 in condition for allowance, and claims 3-9 and 12-14 depend therefrom. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

Newly Added Claims

Newly added claims 15-21 have been added to further emphasize various aspects already presented in originally filed claims. These claims recite limitations deemed allowable by the examiner. No new matter has been added. Entry and allowance of these claims is kindly requested.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1 and 3-21) are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

3/10/06

Date



Scott A. McCollister, Reg. No. 33,961

Anthony M. Del Zoppo, III, Reg. No. 51,606

1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor

Cleveland, OH 44114-2579

216-861-5582

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10, addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Express Mail Label No.:	Signature <i>Laurie A. Boylan</i>
Date <i>March 10, 2006</i>	Printed Name Laurie A. Boylan

N:\GLOZ200308\LAB0004119V001.doc